arXiv:1609.05427v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 18 Sep 2016

September 2016

# Quantum Transport in Presence of Bound States - Noise Power

Mihail Mintchev

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare and Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, Largo Pontecorvo 3, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

Luca Santoni

*Scuola Normale Superiore and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, 56126 Pisa, Italy*

Paul Sorba

*LAPTh, Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Université de Savoie, BP 110, 74941 Annecy-le-Vieux Cedex, France*

**Abstract**

The impact of bound states in Landauer-Büttiker scattering approach to non-equilibrium quantum transport is investigated. We show that the noise power at frequency $\nu$ is sensitive to all bound states with energies $\omega_{\rm b}$ satisfying $|\omega_{\rm b}| < \nu$. We derive the exact expression of the bound state contribution and compare it to the one produced by the scattering states alone. The theoretical and experimental consequences of this result are discussed.

LAPTH-039/16
IFUP-TH 06/2016

# 1 Introduction

Current fluctuations represent a fundamental characteristic feature of quantum transport in systems away from equilibrium. These fluctuations generate noise, which besides spoiling the signal propagation, provides [1]-[3] the experimental basis of noise spectroscopy. Combined with the recent progress [4, 5] in the measurement techniques, such spectroscopy gives a deeper insight [6, 7] in the mechanism of quantum transport at the microscopic level.




Figure 1: Multi-terminal system with scattering matrix $\mathbb{S}$ and heat reservoirs $R_i$.

Some decades ago Landauer [8] proposed a powerful scattering theory framework for the derivation of the particle current, which has been further developed by Büttiker [9]. The Landauer-Büttiker approach goes much beyond the linear response approximation and is the core of modern quantum transport theory. It has been successfully generalised [10]-[12] and applied to the computation of the noise power [13]-[16] and the full counting statistics [17]-[20].

In this paper we address a subtle question in the Landauer-Büttiker (LB) scheme, namely the impact of bound states on the current fluctuations. To be more precise, we consider the multi-terminal system shown in Fig. 1. Each semi-infinite lead $L_i$ is attached at infinity to a heat reservoir $R_i$ with (inverse) temperature $\beta_i$ and chemical potential $\mu_i$. The interaction between the leads is localised at their junction and is described by a unitary scattering matrix $\mathbb{S}$. The system is away from equilibrium if there are leads which communicate via non-vanishing transmission elements of $\mathbb{S}$. Our goal will be to analyse the quantum transport in the case when the analytic structure of $\mathbb{S}$ implies the existence of bound states with energies $\omega_{\rm b}$. In synthesis, we will show that the current fluctuations at frequency $\nu$ are affected by all bound states with energies $|\omega_{\rm b}| < \nu$. We will derive in closed and explicit form both the scattering and bound state contributions $P_{\rm s}$ and $P_{\rm b}$ to the noise power of the system in the LB non-equilibrium steady state. The comparison between $P_{\rm s}$ and $P_{\rm b}$ reveals the essential role of bound states. We adopt the field theory framework of [21]-[23], which allows for a systematic account of all bound states.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we describe in detail the system we are dealing with, focussing on the bound state contribution to the spectrum. In section 3 we compute the connected two-point current correlation function and extract the noise powers $P_{\rm s}$ and $P_{\rm b}$. In section 4 we discuss the general result and illustrate the behavior of the noise

power for some values of the parameters characterising the system. Section 5 collects our conclusions.

## 2 The system

We consider systems where both the particle number and the total energy are conserved. The particle number conservation implies that the total scattering matrix $\mathbb{S}$ is a direct sum of the $m$-body matrices $\{\mathbb{S}^{(m)} : m = 1, 2, ...\}$. Since the treatment of bound states is notoriously a hard task, we focus in what follows on the simplest non-trivial case. Namely, we assume that $\mathbb{S}^{(m)} = \mathbb{I}$ for $m > 1$ and keep non-trivial only the one-body scattering matrix $\mathbb{S}^{(1)} = \mathbb{S}$, which describes the interaction in the junction. This assumption is justified by recalling that the idea of freely propagating fermions along the leads accounts remarkably well [1] for the experimental results [24]. One possible realisation of this scenario is the Schrödinger junction with a point-like defect. Our previous analysis [21]-[23] shows that this system represents a remarkable laboratory for testing general ideas about quantum transport. The study of the bound state problem below confirms once again this statement.

The dynamics along the leads $\{L_i : i = 1, ..., n\}$ is fixed by the Schrödinger equation[1]

$$\left(\mathrm{i}\partial_t + \frac{1}{2m}\partial_x^2\right)\psi(t, x, i) = 0\,, \qquad x \leq 0,\ i = 1, ..., n\,, \tag{2.1}$$

supplemented by the equal time canonical anticommutation relation

$$[\psi(t, x_1, i_1)\,,\, \psi^*(t, x_2, i_2)]_+ = \delta_{i_1 i_2}\,\delta(x_1 - x_2)\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where $*$ stands for Hermitian conjugation. Since (2.2) reflects the completeness of the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, it is essential in what follows for fixing the bound state contribution to field $\psi$.

The junction plays physically the role of a point-like defect. The associated interaction determines the one-body scattering matrix $\mathbb{S}$, which is fixed by requiring that the bulk Hamiltonian $-\partial_x^2$ admits a self-adjoint extension in $x = 0$. All such extensions are defined [25]-[26] by the boundary condition

$$\lim_{x\to 0^-} \sum_{j=1}^{n} [\lambda(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{U})_{ij} + \mathrm{i}(\mathbb{I} + \mathbb{U})_{ij}\partial_x]\,\psi(t, x, j) = 0\,, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix, $\mathbb{U}$ is a generic $n \times n$ unitary matrix and $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter with dimension of mass. Eq. (2.3) guaranties unitary time evolution and implies [25]-[26] the scattering matrix

$$\mathbb{S}(k) = -\frac{[\lambda(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{U}) - k(\mathbb{I} + \mathbb{U})]}{[\lambda(\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{U}) + k(\mathbb{I} + \mathbb{U})]}\,, \tag{2.4}$$

[1] We adopt the natural units $\hbar = c = k_{\mathrm{B}} = 1$.

$k$ being the particle momentum. It is easily seen that $\mathbb{S}(k)$ is a meromorphic function with poles located on the imaginary axis and different from 0. In fact, let $\mathcal{U}$ be the unitary matrix diagonalising $\mathbb{U}$, namely

$$\mathbb{U} = \mathcal{U}\,\mathbb{U}_d\,\mathcal{U}^*\,, \qquad \mathbb{U}_d = \mathrm{diag}\left(\mathrm{e}^{2\mathrm{i}\alpha_1}, ..., \mathrm{e}^{2\mathrm{i}\alpha_n}\right)\,, \tag{2.5}$$

with $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \alpha_i \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Then

$$\mathbb{S}_d(k) \equiv \mathcal{U}^*\mathbb{S}(k)\mathcal{U} = \mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{k+\mathrm{i}\eta_1}{k-\mathrm{i}\eta_1}, ..., \frac{k+\mathrm{i}\eta_n}{k-\mathrm{i}\eta_n}\right)\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\eta_i = \lambda\tan(\alpha_i)\,. \tag{2.7}$$

The set $\mathcal{P}_+$ of poles of (2.6) in upper half-plane ($0 < \alpha_i < \frac{\pi}{2}$) collects the bound states. The representation (2.6) implies that the $n$-terminal junction admits at most $n$ different types of bound states.

Following [27, 28], we represent the field $\psi$ as a linear combination

$$\psi(t,x,i) = \psi_{\mathrm{s}}(t,x,i) + \psi_{\mathrm{b}}(t,x,i)\,, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\psi_{\mathrm{s}}$ collects the contribution of the scattering states and $\psi_{\mathrm{b}}$ that of the bound states. The scattering states read [29]

$$\chi(k;x) = \left[\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}kx}\,\mathbb{I} + \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}kx}\,\mathbb{S}^*(k)\right]\,, \quad k \geq 0\,, \tag{2.9}$$

and define the scattering component

$$\psi_{\mathrm{s}}(t,x,i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{2\pi}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\omega(k)t}\,\chi_{ij}(k;x)a_j(k)\,, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\omega(k) = \frac{k^2}{2m}$ is the dispersion relation and the operators $\{a_i(k),\, a_i^*(k) \,:\, k \geq 0,\, i = 1, ..., n\}$ generate a standard anti-commutation relation algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{s}}$. Using (2.10) one gets

$$[\psi_{\mathrm{s}}(t,x_1,i_1)\,,\, \psi_{\mathrm{s}}^*(t,x_2,i_2)]_+ = \delta_{i_1i_2}\,\delta(x_{12}) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}k}{2\pi}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}k\widetilde{x}_{12}}\mathbb{S}_{i_1i_2}(k)\,, \tag{2.11}$$

where $x_{12} \equiv x_1 - x_2$ and $\widetilde{x}_{12} \equiv x_1 + x_2$. In the presence of bound states ($\mathcal{P}_+ \neq \emptyset$), the second term in the right hand side of (2.11) does not vanish, which reflects the fact that the scattering states (2.9) are incomplete. Using the Cauchy's integral formula and the representation (2.6), one finds

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}k}{2\pi}\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}k\widetilde{x}_{12}}\mathbb{S}_{i_1i_2}(k) = -2\sum_{j\in\mathcal{P}_+}\mathcal{U}_{i_1j}\eta_j\mathrm{e}^{\eta_j\widetilde{x}_{12}}\mathcal{U}^*_{ji_2}\,. \tag{2.12}$$

In order to compensate (2.12) and satisfy the canonical anti-commutator (2.2), we must add new degrees of freedom describing the bound states. For this purpose we introduce the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\rm b}$ generated by the fermion oscillators $\{b_i,\, b_i^*\,:\, i\in\mathcal{P}_+\}$ satisfying

$$[b_{i_1}\,,\,b_{i_2}^*]_+=\delta_{i_1i_2}\,,\qquad [b_{i_1}\,,\,b_{i_2}]_+=[b_{i_1}^*\,,\,b_{i_2}^*]_+=0\,. \tag{2.13}$$

Assuming that the generators of $\mathcal{A}_{\rm s}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\rm b}$ anti-commute, we can write the bound state component in the form

$$\psi_{\rm b}(t,x,i)=\sum_{j\in\mathcal{P}_+}\mathcal{U}_{ij}{\rm e}^{-{\rm i}t\omega_{\rm b}(\eta_j)+\eta_j x}\sqrt{2\eta_j}b_j \tag{2.14}$$

with $\omega_{\rm b}(\eta)\equiv-\frac{\eta^2}{2m}$. At this point one can directly verify that the total field (2.8) indeed satisfies (2.2).

Summarising, each bound state $i\in\mathcal{P}_+$ gives rise at the level of quantum fields to a new degree of freedom described by the oscillator $\{b_i,\,b_i^*\}$. The above construction is fully determined by the completeness of the Hamiltonian eigenstates and, as shown below, allows to evaluate in a systematic way the bound state contribution to the particle current and the noise power.

# 3 Current-current correlation function and noise power with bound states

The particle current in our system has the well known form

$$j(t,x,i)=\frac{\rm i}{2m}\left[\psi^*(\partial_x\psi)-(\partial_x\psi^*)\psi\right](t,x,i)\,. \tag{3.15}$$

In order to compute correlation functions of $j$, we must fix a representation of $\mathcal{A}_{\rm s}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\rm b}$. Following the work of Landauer [8] and Büttiker [9], for the scattering component $\mathcal{A}_{\rm s}$ we take the LB representation, which adapts perfectly to the physical situation shown in Fig. 1. Referring for the details to [29], one has in this representation

$$\langle a_i^*(k)a_j(p)\rangle \;=\; 2\pi\delta(k-p)\delta_{ij}d_i[\omega(k)]\,, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\langle a_j(p)a_i^*(k)\rangle \;=\; 2\pi\delta(k-p)\delta_{ij}\{1-d_i[\omega(k)]\}\,, \tag{3.17}$$

where $d_i(\omega)$ is the Fermi distribution

$$d_i(\omega)=\frac{1}{1+{\rm e}^{\beta_i(\omega-\mu_i)}}\,. \tag{3.18}$$

Since $\psi_{\rm b}$ decays exponentially for $x\to-\infty$, where the heat reservoirs are located, we adopt for $\mathcal{A}_{\rm b}$ the Fock representation, where $b_i$ annihilate the vacuum and

$$\langle b_ib_j^*\rangle=\delta_{ij}\,,\qquad \langle b_i^*b_j\rangle=0\,. \tag{3.19}$$

The multi-particle bound states are created by acting with monomials of the type $\{b^*_{i_1}\cdots b^*_{i_m} : m = 1, 2, ...\}$ on the vacuum.

In this setup the one-point current expectation value equals the well known LB result [8, 9]

$$\langle j(t,x,i)\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi}\left[\delta_{ij} - |\mathbb{S}_{ij}(\sqrt{2m\omega})|^2\right] d_j(\omega)\,. \tag{3.20}$$

The bound state contribution shows up in the higher correlation functions, starting from the connected two-point function in $L_i$

$$\langle j(t_1,x,i)j(t_2,x,i)\rangle^{\mathrm{conn}} \equiv \langle j(t_1,x,i)j(t_2,x,i)\rangle - \langle j(t_1,x,i)\rangle\langle j(t_2,x,i)\rangle\,. \tag{3.21}$$

Since the Hamiltonian of our system is a time independent self-adjoint operator, the energy is conserved and (3.21) depends only on the time difference $t_{12} = t_1 - t_2$. Then the noise power at frequency $\nu$ in $L_i$ is defined [16] by the Fourier transform

$$P(\nu;x,i) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathrm{d}t_{12}\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\nu t_{12}}\,\langle j(t_1,x,i)j(t_2,x,i)\rangle^{\mathrm{conn}}\,. \tag{3.22}$$

In order to simplify the analysis of $P(\nu;x,i)$, it is instructive to represent it in the form

$$P(\nu;x,i) = P_{\mathrm{s}}(\nu;x,i) + P_{\mathrm{b}}(\nu;x,i)\,, \tag{3.23}$$

where $P_{\mathrm{s}}$ collects the pure scattering contribution and $P_{\mathrm{b}}$ vanishes in absence of bound states.

## 3.1 Scattering state contribution

We concentrate first on scattering component, which represents the finite-frequency generalisation of the result of Martin, Landauer [13] and Büttiker [14]. The direct computation using (3.16, 3.17) leads to

$$P_{\mathrm{s}}(\nu;x,i) = \frac{1}{16\pi m}\sum_{j,l=1}^{n}\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{\sqrt{\omega(\nu+\omega)}} d_j(\nu+\omega)L^i_{jl}(x;\nu,\omega)[1-d_l(\omega)]\,, \tag{3.24}$$

with

$$L^i_{jl}(x;\nu,\omega) \equiv |\overline{\chi}_{ij}(\sqrt{2m(\nu+\omega)};x)\,\partial_x\chi_{il}(\sqrt{2m\omega};x) - \chi_{il}(\sqrt{2m\omega};x)\,\partial_x\overline{\chi}_{ij}(\sqrt{2m(\nu+\omega)};x)|^2\,, \tag{3.25}$$

where $\chi$ is given by (2.9) and the bar means complex conjugation. It is instructive to consider the zero-frequency limit

$$P_{\mathrm{s}}(i) = \lim_{\nu\to 0^+} P_{\mathrm{s}}(\nu;x,i)\,, \tag{3.26}$$

which turns out to be $x$-independent. In the two terminal case $n = 2$ the limit (3.26) is in addition $i$-independent[2] and provides a useful check, reproducing the zero-frequency noise power derived in [13]-[16], namely

$$P_{\rm s} = \int_0^\infty \frac{{\rm d}\omega}{2\pi} \big\{ [d_1(\omega) + d_2(\omega) - d_1^2(\omega) - d_2^2(\omega)]\tau^2(\omega) \\ + [d_1(\omega) + d_2(\omega) - 2d_1(\omega)d_2(\omega)]\tau(\omega)[1 - \tau(\omega)] \big\} , \tag{3.27}$$

where $\tau(\omega) = |\mathbb{S}_{12}(\sqrt{2m\omega})|^2$ is the transmission probability. The $\omega$-integration in (3.24,3.27) cannot be performed explicitly for generic values of the heat reservoir parameters. However the integrands have no singularities[3] in the integration domain and the numerical computation is straightforward. The examples in section 4 illustrate this fact.

## 3.2 Bound state contribution

We turn now to the bound state contribution. Using the explicit form (2.14) of $\psi_{\rm b}$, after some algebra one gets

$$P_{\rm b}(\nu; x, i) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{P}_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\theta(2m\nu - \eta_l^2)}{2m\sqrt{2m\nu - \eta_l^2}} \, |\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 \, \eta_l \, {\rm e}^{2x\eta_l} d_j(\nu - \eta_l^2/2m) M_j^i(x; \nu, \eta_l) \, , \tag{3.28}$$

where $\theta$ is the Heaviside step function[4] and

$$M_j^i(x; \nu, \eta) = |\eta \chi_{ij}(\sqrt{2m\nu - \eta^2}; x) - \partial_x \chi_{ij}(\sqrt{2m\nu - \eta^2}; x)|^2 \, . \tag{3.29}$$

Using (2.9) and introducing the combination

$$\kappa_l = 2m\nu - \eta_l^2 \, , \tag{3.30}$$

one gets

$$P_{\rm b}(\nu; x, i) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{P}_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\theta(\kappa_l)}{2m\sqrt{\kappa_l}} \, |\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 \, \eta_l \, {\rm e}^{2x\eta_l} d_j(\kappa_l/2m) \\ \times |(\eta_l - {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l}){\rm e}^{2{\rm i}x\sqrt{\kappa_l}}\delta_{ji} + (\eta_l + {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l})\mathbb{S}_{ji}(\sqrt{\kappa_l})|^2 \, . \tag{3.31}$$

Eq. (3.31) gives in exact and explicit form the bound state contribution $P_{\rm b}$ to the noise power in the LB non-equilibrium steady state and represents our main result. Let us briefly describe the key features of (3.31). We observe first of all that $P_{\rm b}(\nu; x, i)$ is a nonnegative oscillating function of $\nu$ and $x$, which vanishes in the limits $\nu \to \infty$ and $x \to -\infty$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\nu \to 0^+} P_{\rm b}(\nu; x, i) = 0 \, , \tag{3.32}$$

[2]Since, $j(t, 0, 1) = -j(t, 0, 2)$ due to the Kirchhoff rule.
[3]In fact $L_{jl}^i(x; \nu, \omega) \sim \omega + O(\omega^2)$ around $\omega = 0$.
[4]Fixed by $\theta(0) = 1/2$ at the discontinuity point.

implying that the bound states do not affect the zero-frequency noise. Therefore, for detecting a bound state $l \in \mathcal{P}_+$ one needs frequencies $\nu > \eta_l^2/2m = |\omega_{\rm b}(\eta_l)|$. Notice also that the potential discontinuity in (3.31), due to the Heaviside function, is absent because

$$|(\eta_l - {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l}){\rm e}^{2{\rm i}x\sqrt{\kappa_l}}\delta_{ji} + (\eta_l + {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l})\mathbb{S}_{ji}(\sqrt{\kappa_l})|^2 \sim \kappa_l + O(\kappa_l^2) \tag{3.33}$$

around $\kappa_l = 0$.

In the shot noise regime $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_n = \beta \to \infty$ one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\beta\to\infty} P_{\rm b}(\nu; x, i) = \sum_{l\in\mathcal{P}_+}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\theta(\kappa_l)\theta(2m\mu_j - \kappa_l)}{2m\sqrt{\kappa_l}} |\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 \eta_l \, {\rm e}^{2x\eta_l} \\ \times |(\eta_l - {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l}){\rm e}^{2{\rm i}x\sqrt{\kappa_l}}\delta_{ji} + (\eta_l + {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l})\mathbb{S}_{ji}(\sqrt{\kappa_l})|^2 \, .\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Therefore the bound state $l \in \mathcal{P}_+$ contributes to the shot noise for chemical potentials $\mu_j \geq \kappa_l/2m$.

Let us clarify finally the role of the factor $|\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2$ in (3.31). From the unitarity constraint

$$\sum_{l\in\mathcal{P}_+} |\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 \leq \sum_{l=1}^{n} |\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 = 1 \, , \tag{3.35}$$

one infers that $|\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 \in [0, 1]$. Therefore $|\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2$ can be interpreted as a weight factor, which measures the contribution of the bound state $l \in \mathcal{P}_+$ to the particle current in the lead $L_i$ for different choices of the matrix $\mathbb{U}$ in the boundary condition (2.3). It is instructive to consider the following two limiting cases. For generic $\mathbb{U}$ one has $|\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 \neq 0$ for all $l \in \mathcal{P}_+$, implying that all bound states contribute to the current in $L_i$. For diagonal $\mathbb{U}$ one has instead $|\mathcal{U}_{il}|^2 = \delta_{il}$, showing that only the bound state $i \in \mathcal{P}_+$, if it exists, contributes to the current in the lead $L_i$.

To summarise, we derived the bound state contribution to the noise power of the Schrödinger junction, showing that the frequency $\nu$ is the appropriate control parameter for bound state spectroscopy. In fact, by increasing the value of $\nu$ one can identify one after the other all bound states of the system. We will illustrate this remarkable feature by some examples in the next section.

# 4 Comparison between $P_{\rm s}$ and $P_{\rm b}$

We describe now the impact of bound states on the noise power. From the unitarity of $\mathbb{S}$ one infers that

$$|(\eta_l - {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l}){\rm e}^{2{\rm i}x\sqrt{\kappa_l}}\delta_{ji} + (\eta_l + {\rm i}\sqrt{\kappa_l})\mathbb{S}_{ji}(\sqrt{\kappa_l})|^2 \leq 4m\nu \, . \tag{4.36}$$

Inserting (4.36) in (3.31) an using the unitarity of $\mathcal{U}$ one finds the upper bound

$$P_{\rm b}(\nu;x,i) \leq 2\nu \sum_{l\in\mathcal{P}_+}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\theta(\kappa_l)}{\sqrt{\kappa_l}}\,\eta_l\,{\rm e}^{2x\eta_l} d_j(\kappa_l/2m)\,. \tag{4.37}$$

The estimate (4.37) holds for any lead $L_i$ and shows that the effect of the bound states decays exponentially with the distance from the junction. This is a simple consequence of the form of the bound state wave functions manifest in (2.14). It turns out that close to the junction the bound state noise power $P_{\rm b}$ can dominate the scattering contribution $P_{\rm s}$. In order to illustrate this feature we consider the two-lead junction ($n = 2$). In this case the most general scattering matrix is generated by substituting

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{pmatrix} {\rm e}^{{\rm i}\varphi}\cos(\theta/2) & \sin(\theta/2) \\ -\sin(\theta/2) & {\rm e}^{-{\rm i}\varphi}\cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.38}$$

in (2.6) and has the form

$$\mathbb{S}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{k^2+{\rm i}k(\eta_1-\eta_2)\cos(\theta)+\eta_1\eta_2}{(k-{\rm i}\eta_1)(k-{\rm i}\eta_2)} & \frac{-{\rm i}{\rm e}^{{\rm i}\varphi}k(\eta_1-\eta_2)\sin(\theta)}{(k-{\rm i}\eta_1)(k-{\rm i}\eta_2)} \\ \frac{-{\rm i}{\rm e}^{-{\rm i}\varphi}k(\eta_1-\eta_2)\sin(\theta)}{(k-{\rm i}\eta_1)(k-{\rm i}\eta_2)} & \frac{k^2-{\rm i}k(\eta_1-\eta_2)\cos(\theta)+\eta_1\eta_2}{(k-{\rm i}\eta_1)(k-{\rm i}\eta_2)} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.39}$$

where $\varphi$ and $\theta$ are arbitrary angles. We assume for illustration that two bound states $\eta_1 = 2$ and $\eta_2 = 4$ (in units of mass $m$) are present and take $\theta = 2\pi/3$ and $\varphi = \pi/4$. Finally, fixing the heat reservoir parameters $\{\beta_1 = 1,\, \beta_2 = 2,\, \mu_1 = 2,\, \mu_2 = 3\}$ and setting $m = 1$, we get the plot in Fig.2, which indeed shows that $P_{\rm b}$ exceeds $P_{\rm s}$ at small $x$.




Figure 2: $x$-dependence of $P_{\rm b}$ and $P_{\rm s}$ at $\nu = 3$.

The frequency behavior is much more interesting. Using the same heat bath parameters and angles as before, we obtain the plot displayed in Fig. 3. We observe first that the bound state contribution is essential and dominating in certain frequency ranges. Second, there are discontinuities in the $\nu$-derivative of $P_{\rm b}$ at $\nu = \eta_l^2/2m$, which clearly mark the bound states and are followed by characteristic resonant-like peaks. As already mentioned, this behavior




Figure 3: $\nu$-dependence of $P_\mathrm{b}$ and $P_\mathrm{s}$ at $x = -1$.




Figure 4: $\nu$-dependence of $P = P_\mathrm{b} + P_\mathrm{s}$ at $x = -1$.

represents an attractive tool for bound state spectroscopy. In a finite-frequency experimental setup [30] one is usually not able to separate $P_\mathrm{b}$ from the total noise power $P = P_\mathrm{s} + P_\mathrm{b}$. For this reason we report in Fig. 4 the plot of $P$, showing that the imprint of the bound states at $\nu = 2$ and $\nu = 8$ is clearly visible in that case as well.

Summarising, we have shown that bound states have relevant and specific impact on both the $x$ and $\nu$-dependence of the finite-frequency noise power and thus provide interesting experimental signatures.

# 5 Outlook and Conclusions

The main scope of this paper was to investigate the role of bound states in the Landauer-Büttiker scattering approach to non-equilibrium quantum transport. For this purpose we considered a simple but nontrivial exactly solvable system, namely the Schrödinger junction with a point-like defect. In this case the total spectrum of the Hamiltonian is fully under control and one can determine exactly the scattering and bound state components $P_\mathrm{s}$ and $P_\mathrm{b}$ of the finite-frequency noise power $P = P_\mathrm{s} + P_\mathrm{b}$. We established the basic properties of $P_\mathrm{s}$ and $P_\mathrm{b}$ and showed that the frequency dependence of $P$ provides a precise picture of the

bound state structure of the system. This result finds a direct application to bound state spectroscopy.

The above framework extends in a straightforward way to the heat current and the relative noise power. Moreover, it can be adopted for the study of the bound state contribution to the higher current cumulants. It will be interesting in this respect to investigate the impact of bound states on the probability distribution, generating these cumulants. The extension of the above approach to systems involving Majorana bound states, which attract recently some attention [31]-[33], is also a challenging open problem.

**Acknowledgments:**

M.M. would like to thank the Laboratoire de Physique Théorique d'Annecy-le-Vieux for the kind hospitality.

# References

[1] R. Landauer, Nature **392**, 658 (1998).

[2] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 724 (1994).

[3] P. Samuelsson and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 041305 (2006).

[4] J. Bylander, T. Duty and P. Delsing, Nature **434**, 361 (2005).

[5] S. Jezouin F. D. Parmentier, A. Anthore, U. Gennser, A. Cavanna, Y. Jin and F. Pierre, Science **342**, 601 (2013).

[6] A. Bid, N. Ofek, H. Inoue, M. Heilbum, C. L. Kane, V. Umansky and D. Mahalu, Nature **466**, 585 (2010).

[7] A. Kamra, F. P. Witek, S. Meyer, H. Huebl, S. Geprägs, R. Gross, G. E. W. Bauer and S. T. B. Goennewein, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 214419 (2014).

[8] R. Landauer, IBM J. Res. Dev. **1**, 233 (1957); Philos. Mag. **21**, 863 (1970).

[9] M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**,1761 (1986); IBM J. Res. Dev. **32**, 317 (1988).

[10] P. W. Anderson, D. J. Thouless, A. Abrahams and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 3519 (1980).

[11] D. S. Fisher and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 6851 (1981).

[12] U. Sivan and Y. Imry, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 551 (1986).

[13] Th. Martin and R. Landauer, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 1742 (1992).

[14] M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 12485 (1992).

[15] M. J. M. de Jong and C. W. J. Beenakker, in Mesoscopic Electron Transport, edited by L. L. Sohn, L. P. Kouwenhoven and G. Schoen, NATO ASI Series 345 (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1997), 225.

[16] Ya. M. Blanter and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rep. **336**, 1 (2000).

[17] V. K. Khlus, Sov. Phys. JETP **66**, 1243 (1987).

[18] G. B. Lesovik, JETP Lett. **49**, 592 (1989).

[19] L. S. Levitov and G. B. Lesovik, JETP Lett. **55**, 555 (1992).

[20] G. B. Lesovik and N. M. Chtchelkatchev, JETP Lett. **77**, 393 (2003).

[21] M. Mintchev, L. Santoni and P. Sorba, J. Phys. A **48**, 055003 (2015).

[22] M. Mintchev, L. Santoni and P. Sorba, J. Phys. A **48**, 285002 (2015).

[23] M. Mintchev, L. Santoni and P. Sorba, J. Phys. A **49**, 265002 (2016).

[24] A. Kumar, L. Saminadayar, D. C. Glattli, Y. Jin and B. Etiene, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2778 (1996).

[25] V. Kostrykin and R. Schrader, Fortschr. Phys. **48**, 703 (2000).

[26] M. Harmer, J. Phys. A **33**, 9015 (2000).

[27] B. Bellazzini, M. Mintchev and P. Sorba, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 19113 (2010).

[28] B. Bellazzini, M. Mintchev and P. Sorba, J. Math. Phys. **51**, 032302 (2010).

[29] M. Mintchev, J. Phys. A **44**, 415201 (2011).

[30] N. Ubbelohde, C. Fricke, C. Flindt, F. Holds and R. J. Haug, Nature Communications, **3**, 612 (2012).

[31] A. Golub and B. Horovitz, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 153415 (2011).

[32] H.-F. Lü, H.-Z. Lu and S.-Q. Shen, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 195404 (2014).

[33] S. Valentini, M. Governale, R. Fazio and F. Taddei, Phys. E **75**, 15 (2016).